



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/286,133	04/01/1999	STEWART SABADELL	49658-024	4582

29989 7590 06/13/2003

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
1600 WILLOW STREET  
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

SHARON, AYAL I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2123

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2003

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

20

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/286,133	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SABADELL ET AL. <i>M</i>	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ayal I Sharon	<b>Art Unit</b> 2123	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Ayal I Sharon (Examiner). (3) Brian Hickman (Applicants' Representative).  
 (2) John Henkhaus (Applicants' Representative). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 June 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: See attached "Proposed Agenda" and "Exhibit A".

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lowry et al, U.S. Patent 4,864,497.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Ayal I. Sharon  
 Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants' Representatives argued that the "snapshot file" in Lowry (col.11, lines 40-65) does not teach multiple changes to the master data file such that the changes do not overwrite one another. Examiner pointed out that the DBC Lock (col.11, lines 40-65 and col.31, lines 29-42) does teach multiple changes to the data structure such that the changes do not overwrite one another.

Applicant's Representatives also argued that Lowry does not teach conversion of formats nor filtering of relevant data fields. Examiner pointed out the teachings in Fig.5a, especially the Converters (Items 570 and 540) and Retrieval Programs (Items 580 and 590) taught in greater detail in col.9, lines 38-52, as well as in other places in Lowry.

Examiner argued that the Lowry reference and the instant application are functionally equivalent.

Applicants' Representatives replied that there are 3 ways of reading Lowry's "database object" in light of the Applicants' term "object" in Claim 1. More specifically, the 3 readings of Lowry are:

- 1) The "object" is a database field with a format not supported by the source application
- 2) The "object" is a database record including a field with a format not supported by the source application
- 3) The "object" is a database record containing only fields supported by the source application

According to the Applicants' representatives, none of the readings satisfy all of the limitations of Claim 1.

The Examiner and the Applicants' Representatives agreed that the Applicants' Representatives would provide a detailed discussion of their argument regard the 3 readings of Lowry in their upcoming Amendment. The parties also agreed that Applicants' Representatives would not need to submit their summary of this interview .

49658-0024

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	)	Confirmation No. 4582
STEWART SABADELL, et al	)	
	)	Art Unit: 2123
Serial No.: 09/286,133	)	
	)	Examiner: Ayal I. Sharon
Filing Date: April 1, 1999	)	
	)	
For: TRANSLATING OBJECTS BETWEEN SOFTWARE APPLICATIONS WHICH EMPLOY DIFFERENT DATA FORMATS		

**PROPOSED AGENDA FOR INTERVIEW**

Sir:

An agenda for a telephonic interview for the referenced application is presented below.

1. Describe example of problem in the art, which is solved by invention recited in claim 1.

In summary, when an object is translated/converted from Application A to Application B, and further changes are made to the object in each application, with the change made in Application B not being supported by Application A, when the object is translated again from Application A to Application B, the changes made in Application B are lost.

2. Describe how the disclosure of the cited reference, Lowry, is an instance of the problem described above and, therefore, how it cannot and does not anticipate claim 1. **See Exhibit A.**

In summary, Lowry attempts to "integrate" multiple applications to allow transfer of output data from a first application as input data for a second application. Lowry discloses a common data structure stored in a common database for access by a plurality of applications. A snapshot file represents **different versions of a data file** by storing a copy of a version of a master data file and portions of a master data file that have been updated (col. 11, lines 52-55)(See Exhibit A). However, there is no version that includes multiple changes to the portion of the master data file(See Exhibit A). Hence, there is no teaching or suggestion of at least the following feature of claim 1:

revising said target object in said target application to reflect said second modification to said source object **without removing said first modification to said target object**